

ROCHESTER HISTORY

Edited by BLAKE McKELVEY, *City Historian*

VOL. XV

APRIL, 1953

No. 2

A History of the Rochester Shoe Industry

By BLAKE McKELVEY

For half a century Rochester was one of the country's leading shoe towns, ranking fourth or fifth at times in the value of its product and serving for many years as the chief style center for women's footwear. The shoe trade even held first place briefly among Rochester industries during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and remained a strong rival to the dominant clothing industry for several decades more. And if the shoe manufacturers, like the flour millers and nurserymen before them, have suffered a decline, it was not for the same reasons or with the finality of their predecessors. Shoes are in fact still produced in Rochester and while this industry has never supplied the city with a catchy nickname or otherwise dominated its imagination, it has contributed important leaders, highlighted basic problems, and in many other ways played a significant role in the city's history.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of the shoe industry was the new opportunities it presented for productive enterprise and fruitful jobs during the critical years following the eclipse of Rochester's milling industry. A fresh surge of vitality enlivened the community as humble shoemakers and tanners developed into venturesome manufacturers and gave welcome employment to the skilled newcomers from foreign lands who were arriving in increasing numbers a century ago. Unfortunately, the shoe industry presented hazards as well as opportunities. The rapid advance of its industrialization during the second

ROCHESTER HISTORY, published quarterly by the Rochester Public Library, distributed free at the Library, by mail 25 cents per year. Address correspondence to the City Historian, Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester 4, N. Y.

half of the nineteenth century brought repeated crises in its labor-management relations. Indeed, two of Rochester's most protracted work stoppages occurred in this industry, the second and most spectacular in 1922 shortly before its decline set in. However the decline of the Rochester shoe industry in the twenties involved many more complex causes than this simple chronology would suggest and prompts a full review of the shoe industry's place in Rochester's history.

Pioneer Shoemakers

Like other new settlements and established towns from time immemorial, Rochester attracted enterprising shoemakers as soon as the number of its residents provided a market. Abner Wakelee was the first shoemaker to settle here, in May 1815, shortly after the first tailor, the first blacksmith, the first bookseller and some three hundred other residents had arrived. The phenomenal growth which Rochester experienced during the next twelve years, as the population increased more than thirty fold, brought nearly one hundred additional shoemakers to town before the first village directory was published in 1827. Most of them were apprentices who found quarters in scattered boarding houses, but forty-three were householders and several of the latter established small retail shops.¹ Thus the handicraft system based on individual shoemakers speedily gave way to the domestic or shop system in which an enterprising shoemaker organized and supervised the work of a dozen or more journeymen and apprentices.

One of the oldest and perhaps the largest of the shoemakers' shops of early Rochester was that of Jacob Gould who ran a half-page advertisement in the first directory announcing "a plentiful supply of every description of Gentlemen's and Ladies' boots and shoes" for both the wholesale and retail trade.² Three of Rochester's pioneer shoemakers were tanners too, and at least ten enterprising shops ran advertisements in the local weeklies before the opening of the canal in the mid-twenties.

A good description of these early shoe shops was provided years later by Jesse W. Hatch, one of Rochester's most illustrious shoemen. Jesse Hatch did not locate permanently at Rochester until 1831, but he came to town frequently as a lad and as a shoemaker's apprentice visited several of the local tanneries and shoe shops on errands for his father. He had a retentive memory, as his addresses before the

historical society in later years revealed, and his description of these early shops is full of vivid detail:

It was customary for the boss, with the younger apprentices, to occupy the room in front where, with bared arms and leather aprons, they performed their work and met their customers. A shop in the rear or above would be occupied by the tramping journeymen and the older apprentices. . . . The shops were low rooms in which fifteen to twenty men worked, seated in rows, on long benches with space sufficient between so that their knees would not touch the bench in front. There was a space in the center of the room where all did their washing in a tub and wet their stock in common. The light by which they worked at night was tallow candles. Their days of work averaged from twelve to sixteen hours; their wages from six to nine dollars a week. With this compensation they were generally contented and happy and strikes were unknown. The process of making shoes was comparatively noiseless which gave the workmen an opportunity for reading aloud and for discussing the subject matter read. . . . The reading encouraged most of them to desire a higher and better life.³

Jesse Hatch counted nine shoe shops in Rochester at the time of his arrival in 1831. Some were large shops, as described above; others were single rooms in which the shoemaker took the measurements of his customers, prepared the lasts and cut the leather, but sent the materials by runner boys to one of the boarding houses where the work of sewing and pegging was done. Already a machine to cut out wooden pegs had been invented in Rochester, and while it was not as successful as another machine introduced from the East, the village was beginning to gain repute for the quality of its pegged shoes.⁴

Rochester's first great boom, stimulated by the building and opening of the Erie Canal, came to an end in 1829. Many speculative ventures suffered in the recession that followed, but the steady flow of migrants westward along the canal kept the shoemakers of Rochester busy. Some even ventured to ship their surplus shoes to jobbers further west, but most were content to supply the local market. As all of the local shoe merchants were themselves shoemakers, the first threat of eastern competition brought a united response. However, the Shoe Deal-

ers' Association, organized in 1844 to forestall the dumping of eastern stocks in Rochester, proved more useful in curbing price cuts and other injurious practices locally. The only sure method for holding their own against the increasing output of eastern shoe shops, whose surplus was now flowing westward by canal and railroad, was by improving the quality of the local product, as Hatch and several of his associates endeavored to do.⁵

The modest achievements of these early years were largely due to the enterprise and skill of the shoemakers themselves, but close collaboration with the tanners was a source of strength. Prominent among the latter were the Churchill brothers who came to Rochester in 1840. When, after two years, a surplus of hides was accumulated, Henry Churchill joined with Jesse Hatch in the J. W. Hatch Shoe Company, the one putting up \$100 in hides and the other \$100 in lasts and tools, thus providing capital for a business which totaled \$6000 in sales the first year.⁶ This establishment was modest compared with that of Messers Sage & Pancost who already employed over one hundred shoemakers and produced several thousand shoes for export each month. By 1848 the editor of the daily *Democrat* could list eleven shoe shops employing an estimated total of five hundred men and women and paying wages aggregating \$75,000 a year.⁷

The healthy trade of the Rochester shoemakers was nevertheless overshadowed by that of the millers, particularly in capital invested and in the gross value of the product. Rochester's output of boots and shoes did not greatly exceed that of other leading canal towns. Troy and Utica and Syracuse were each active rivals for the shoe trade on the canal, though only Troy produced as many shoes as Rochester in 1855. New York, Philadelphia, and several New England cities were far ahead of Rochester in their bid for the shoe trade at the mid-century, but it was still only the start of a long and grueling race.⁸

Early Shoe Factories

The ready-made shoe business entered a new era of competition in the late forties. Central shops or factories were developing in Rochester as in the leading shoe towns of the East. The standardization of process and of product, the introduction of the team system, which enabled one skilled worker to direct the work of several specialized assistants, the application of rollers and strippers to the preparation of

sole leather — these and other developments were giving the shoemen of Massachusetts, particularly those of Lynn and Haverhill and Boston, an advantage over their less businesslike rivals. Rochester had previously retained its local market chiefly because of the quality of its products, most of them made, if not to order, at least for the critical retail trade. But already a few shoemen, notably Sage & Pancost, had developed factory shops of their own and were producing for the wholesale market. Only an alert readiness to adopt new ideas and methods would enable such firms to meet the eastern competition now that the channels of trade were improving.

Jesse W. Hatch who took the lead locally in the next stage of industrialization — the introduction of machinery — recalled years later how an earnest promoter of the Singer sewing machine had persuaded him to try it out on shoe uppers in 1852. After a series of trials and adjustments in his shop, the Singer machine was successfully adapted to the needs of the shoe industry and served more satisfactorily in Hatch's opinion than the Howe machine which was likewise being applied to shoe uppers in Lynn and Philadelphia that year. Hatch & Churchill and Sage & Pancost shared exclusive use of the new machine in Monroe County. Shortly after the installation of several sewing machines in their central shops, eliminating the need to send the uppers out to be sewed in shoemakers homes or boarding houses, the number of finished uppers became so great that Hatch was prompted to invent a die to cut out the soles. A similar device had been used to cut out the leather visors for army caps, while standard patterns for shoe uppers were old in the trade, but the new die was at least a fresh and important application of the idea, and Hatch & Churchill were duly awarded a patent in 1855 which was later sustained in the courts.⁹

As Rochester was beginning in these years to specialize in women's shoes, Jesse Hatch determined, in December 1853, to visit Lynn, already the leading shoe town and active in the same specialty. He found, as he later recalled, no great advancement there, either in the methods of work or in the organization of shops, but he did take note of two machines used there in stripping and cutting sole leather. Both were brought back to Rochester where the development of the factory system was advancing apace.

Jesse Hatch had acquired a new and larger shop in 1852 shortly after the number of his employees had exceeded one hundred, and a still larger establishment was required by 1856. Sage & Pancost increased the number of their "hands" to three hundred that year, prompting an enthusiastic writer to describe the factory as the largest shoe shop west of Lynn.¹⁰ The wheelbarrows and baby carriages which had formerly gathered at the backdoors of the shoe shops, returning the completed work and receiving new lots of cut leather and uppers, disappeared as the factories concentrated more and more of the work under one roof where adequate supervision could assure its quality and speed its completion. Sage & Pancost were the first in Rochester to appropriate a five-story building for a shoe factory.¹¹

By 1860 most of the shoe trade of Rochester had been absorbed into twelve central shops or factories. Although fifty-five smaller shoe shops were still listed in outlying parts of Monroe County at that date, their decline was rapid during the Civil War years, partly because many shoemakers were called into the service and partly because the boots and shoes of their former male customers were now contracted for wholesale through army supply channels. Rochester received its share of army orders, despite its slight interest in men's shoes. L. and H. Churchill advertised for five hundred additional shoemakers at one time in 1861 in order to meet the demand; when new orders rewarded the completion of their first batch, a subcontract was given to Tarrant Brothers who undertook to devote the full time of their seventy-five workmen to army shoes.¹² Whereas the value of Rochester's output of boots and shoes had doubled between 1855 and 1860, it practically trebled again by 1865 when the total value reached \$1,428,800.¹³

Two other significant developments marked the shoe industry in these years. The application of power to the newly introduced sewing machines occurred in two Rochester factories during the early sixties, though it would be many years before mechanical power played a very large role in shoe manufacturing. Much more important was the organization in 1863 of the first five shoemakers unions which became a major part of the newly formed Rochester Trades Assembly that December.¹⁴ One of the shoe unions represented the women who already comprised nearly a third of the shoe workers, and their union was the first to call a strike when in May 1866 the Churchill factory

announced wage cuts of from eight to twenty per cent on their piecework tasks. The company declared that the girls had been making inflated wages, ranging from eleven to fifteen dollars a week; the girls replied that six dollars a week had been a good average and that they could not maintain themselves at the reduced rates. The girls lost the strike and most of them lost their jobs too, as new girls were hired to take their places.¹⁵ Nothing more was heard of this or the other shoe unions until in 1868 a new effort was made to organize the shoe workers, this time by the Knights of St. Crispin, a secret organization which staged its first national meeting at Rochester that July. Its first formal parade in October 1869 turned out 450 men to march in honor of their national commander.¹⁶

Most of the tasks in the new shoe factories still required hand work, but the process of specialization and standardization was reducing at least the variety of skills required of each worker. No general apprentices were now trained, though experience and skill were still prerequisites for a good cutter or laster and for several of the other specialized jobs. One factory carefully divided the tasks into forty eight distinct operations. Some of the traditional jobs were gradually disappearing from the average factory as new specialized shops began to carve out lasts wholesale by machine, to make patented insoles and perform other specific services for the shoe trade. Rochester had its shops of this sort, as well as machine shops specializing in shoemakers tools.¹⁷ No shoe factory was now complete without a number of Howe or Singer sewing machines for work on the uppers, and the new Blake-McKay machine, designed to sew the soles to the uppers, made its appearance in local factories in the late sixties. Since one such machine displaced several workers, the men naturally regarded it with disfavor, and some manufacturers still preferred the superior craftsmanship possible on the peg shoes, but when the new Goodyear welt machine, perfected in the mid-seventies, was introduced at Rochester in 1879, the triumph of the machine and of the sewed shoe was assured.¹⁸

A description of the factory of the reorganized Pancost, Sage & Company, still the largest in Rochester and employing seven hundred operatives in 1869, revealed the prevailing trend. The old lapstones had long since been replaced by rollers which prepared the sole leather more quickly and evenly for cutting, now done exclu-

sively by power-driven dies. In addition to the standard batteries of Howe and Singer sewers, there was a nailing machine, biting off wire and attaching the soles in one operation, and a pegging machine which did the same with wooden pegs, both still holding their own in competition with Blake-McKay machines, as the multiplicity of styles permitted. A fifth of the operatives in this factory were women, and by 1874 a weekly output of 8,000 pairs of ladies' shoes in three hundred distinct styles created a product valued at \$1,000,000 for the year.¹⁹ The Hatch factory on Front Street, though much smaller in size, was likewise equipped with all the latest machines and prompted an enthusiastic visitor to describe it in 1871 as the model shoe factory in America.²⁰

Such rapid industrialization naturally aggravated the labor-management situation. Each new machine not only antiquated older skills but precipitated a fresh struggle to determine the appropriate rates to be paid its operatives. When, in February, 1871, the Gould shoe factory announced a wage cut of thirty per cent, all its workers went out on strike. The St. Crispins rallied enough support to keep their men out for several weeks, and while some returned to share their former tasks with new non-union men, the company's apparent triumph lasted but a few months before its bankruptcy was announced. Yet the Crispins never enrolled more than six or seven hundred members and seldom turned out more than four hundred for a parade.²¹

Fortunately, continued expansion in the industry and in the country as a whole was more than sufficient to absorb the workers displaced by machines during the sixties and early seventies. When, however, hard times came in 1873, the factories terminated their production schedules in November or early December and delayed the resumption of work on new styles until late January or February—thus granting winter vacations which left many families in desperate straits.²² Nevertheless there was always a rumor of a new factory about to open in Rochester, and even in the depth of the depression word arrived of the plans of James T. Stewart to open a large factory which would employ five hundred "hands" in the manufacture of the new rubber shoes made possible by the Goodyear process. It would not supply traditional shoemaker's jobs, but, as this was the first such factory west of the Hudson, Rochester took delight in the announcement.³²

Shoes Take First Place in Rochester

The shoe industry assumed primary importance in Rochester during the seventies and held that position throughout the eighties. To be sure, both the liquor and clothing industries outranked shoes in capital investment, while clothing and milling excelled in the gross value of their finished products, yet as the shoe industry led all others in the value added to its product and in the total wages paid, its primacy was generally conceded. Shoes likewise led in the number regularly employed—a definition which excluded the part-time home workers still numerous in the clothing industry. The categories in which shoes lead were the important ones, as far as the mass of the city's population was concerned, and its importance here helped to account for the fact that the shoe industry gave rise to two of the city's most dramatic and significant labor-management conflicts. Rochester's position as the fifth or sixth in output among American shoe towns was likewise secured in these years, and its commitment to quality products was finally determined.

The number of shoe firms producing for the wholesale trade had begun to mount during the late sixties. While many dropped out during the hard times of the mid-seventies, several of the leaders of this and a later period dated from pre-depression years, notably Patrick Cox, E. P. Reed, Hough & Ford, Wright & Peters, Thomas Bolton and others. Their factories, like those of their predecessors in the industry, were generally located in rented quarters at first and were situated either in the Water Street or the Mill Street areas. As the number of their "hands" increased from the seventy-five or one hundred of the seventies to two or three hundred or even six hundred during the eighties, the need for new and more permanent quarters prompted several of the firms to erect factory buildings of their own. A considerable increase in the amount of capital invested in plants resulted. Fortunately the leaders were at the same time assuming more active roles in the city's financial affairs, serving on the boards of banks and trust companies and as presidents of the Chamber of Commerce, and the resources of the community rallied to their aid.²⁴ The fifty-one shops and factories of 1890 reported an aggregate capital of over \$3,000,000, a fifth of it in plant, nearly equal to the total capital of two decades before.²⁵

The shoe manufacturers of Rochester were establishing themselves nationally as well as locally. Their total output of about 10,000 pairs of shoes a day during the eighties commanded respect.²⁶ Moreover the quality of the local product won Rochester the position of style center for women's shoes, a leadership challenged at times by Brooklyn and Haverhill but never usurped in these years. The fine quality was due in part to the high grade of leather and the skilled workmanship available in Rochester, but quality and style were achieved because management insisted on them. They were deemed essential because Rochester's interior position placed its factories at a disadvantage in serving the mass markets available to coastal cities. The Erie Canal's utility for other than heavy freight had long since been disproved, and since Rochester's shoes had to travel by rail the incentive to capture the high price market in urban centers across the country made Rochester manufacturers peculiarly sensitive to style changes. They employed machines not primarily for volume of output but to secure standardization of detail and perfection of execution. By dividing the work into numerous small and light tasks, the number of women workers was increased, permitting an economy in wages. Careful supervision was important at all stages of the process, and the managers, old shoemakers themselves, selected their foremen from among their early associates or from the skilled craftsmen who were still coming from abroad, notably from Germany.²⁷ When eastern shoemen, hard pressed by their competitors, sought relief by moving to low wage areas further inland, Rochester shoemen, valuing quality more, held fast to their highgrade labor supply. Indeed, its reputation for skill attracted several important firms to Rochester in these years.²⁸ They preferred instead to seek economy in low rentals on Mill and Center Streets.²⁹

The Rochester shoemen took an active part in the unsuccessful efforts of manufacturers throughout the country to block a reissue of the McKay patents in 1880,³⁰ and they assumed leadership in a move, seven years later, to organize a national protective association designed to meet the Knights of Labor on an equal basis.³¹ Rochester was a favorite center for the conventions of the National Retail Shoe Dealers Association³² and for the meetings of traveling shoe salesmen and union leaders too. Its central position in the trade, geographically, was a considerable advantage, though it subjected

Rochester quickly to every new disturbance as well as to every new advance.

Since each improvement in manufacturing technique brought a labor disturbance in its wake, Rochester's hasty introduction of new machines made it a center of labor turmoil in these years. The Knights of St. Crispin, organized locally in 1868, were not opposed to new machines as such but insisted that they should be manned by the craftsmen they displaced rather than by "green hands." The Crispins of Rochester, organized in two lodges, one for English speaking and one for German speaking shoemakers, were the strongest local union group in 1874, yet their efforts to forestall a wage cut the next December proved futile, almost disastrous.³³ The Crispins had been broken in Philadelphia and in the Massachusetts shoe towns a year or two before, and Rochester was practically their last stronghold. They made a resolute stand, arguing that Rochester's quality standards would be sacrificed if wages were cut again (they had accepted a thirty per cent cut late in 1873 when their brother Crispins in the East had resisted it), but the best they could do, after an eight week strike, was to secure a reduction of the proposed cut from twenty-five to twelve and a half per cent. Work was resumed on this basis and continued with remarkable tranquillity until 1880 when the newly formed Knights of Labor (confused in the press with the Knights of St. Crispin whom they had absorbed) secured a wage boost of fifteen per cent to restore the earlier cut.³⁴

In most of the early conflicts one of the manufacturers generally precipitated the trouble and took the brunt of the strike. In 1871 it had been the Gould Company, in 1875 the E. P. Reed factory, and in 1880 the A. H. Johnson plant.³⁵ To correct this situation and assure cooperative resistance to labor action, an Employers Protective Association was organized in 1880, and a fund was subscribed to support members against unreasonable union demands. The move was a response in part to the establishment of local branches of the newly formed Knights of Labor, and the first test came two years later, when John Kelly, after a seasonal suspension, refused to rehire two union leaders formerly employed at his plant. The Protective Association voted to pay \$1,000 a week to support Kelly in the strike which followed. The efforts of the mayor and other leading citizens to negotiate a settlement were blocked by the association, which

likewise rejected the union's first offer to arbitrate the question. Kelly imported enough strike breakers to open his plant, and when the resulting disturbances threatened a spread of the strike, arbitration was finally agreed upon and a decision releasing Kelly from the charge of blacklisting was rendered.³⁶

The next few years were prosperous and fairly peaceful. The press was curiously silent about a shoemakers convention held at Rochester in September, 1883, possibly because of a reluctance to support an independent lasters union in a community dominated by the Knights of Labor assemblies.³⁷ A Lasters Protective was formed, nevertheless, and in 1886 it won a small advance from the Williams & Hoyt firm, bringing the wages there up to the local standard. The lasters got what they demanded merely by the threat of a strike, but the cutters in the Knights of Labor, which was theoretically opposed to a use of the strike weapon, had to organize a full fledged strike in November, 1887, to ward off a cut. A State Board of Mediation and Arbitration had been created in 1886, and the offer of its services was accepted by both sides. After some publicity of the grievances on both sides, the Knights dropped their original demand for a ten-hour day and for Saturday half-holidays but urged that better planning of production schedules could relieve the industry of the recurrent rush periods, when twelve- and fourteen-hour days were required, only to be followed by long seasons of idleness.³⁸ The Knights would not recede on their wage stand, and the State Board, failing to negotiate a settlement, closed its hearings without recommendations. Tempers mounted because of the impasse, and several manufacturers brought strike breakers from the depressed shoe trade in Philadelphia. The Knights persuaded many of these men to return to their homes, and the strike dragged on for thirteen weeks, by which time both sides and the city at large were exhausted and ready for a compromise settlement effected late in January.⁴⁰

The Knights, while moderately successful in this contest, had been handicapped by the loose and general character of their organization. The establishment of a separate shoemakers assembly in 1887 had helped to remedy this defect, but its national officers, lacking any strike fund based on regular dues, had been reluctant to order assessments to support the Rochester strike because of their general opposition to strikes. Practical leaders in the shoemakers assembly

soon launched a move in Rochester and the other shoe towns to break free from the Knights. The move was delayed for a time in Rochester when the Shoemakers District Assembly Number 216, Knights of Labor, selected that city for its annual convention in June, 1888,⁴¹ but the formation of independent shoemakers unions was resumed the next year.⁴²

The new shoe unions soon affiliated with the Boot and Shoe Workers International, American Federation of Labor. A local Shoeworkers Council was formed to promote cooperation among the unions, and a satisfactory agreement was worked out with the Shoe Manufacturers Association in January 1890.⁴³ One of the new unions was able to reach an amicable understanding with J. W. Naylor, facilitating the introduction of improved manufacturing techniques, despite worker resistance at first,⁴⁴ and the council turned out 1,000 shoeworkers to march in the Labor Day parade that year.⁴⁵ But the lasters union could not reach an agreement with Patrick Cox as to the proper wage for operatives on the new lasting machines he was introducing in both his Rochester and Fairport plants, and the strike called against the Cox factories in June eventually precipitated one of Rochester's most protracted labor controversies.

The causes of the strike became more and more obscure as the controversy developed. Patrick Cox, who had opened a branch plant in Fairport three years before in order to escape the union, only to be followed by a union drive there, maintained that the union had challenged his right to introduce new machinery, and the Shoe Manufacturers Association voted to support him in this stand. The union maintained that its strike was designed merely to secure for its members the right to operate the new machines at rates equal to their earlier hand work.⁴⁶ When Cox answered the strike by importing strike breakers under a guarantee that their jobs would not be sacrificed in any settlement with the union, the strike situation reached a stalemate. The Manufacturers Association decided to force a settlement by a lockout of all members of the Boot and Shoe Workers International.⁴⁷ This bold action, on December 1, 1890, put some 3,000 workers out of work and prompted an investigation by the State Board of Mediation and Arbitration.

Again the State Board, headed by William Purcell of Rochester, editor of the *Union and Advertiser*, provided a convenient sounding

board, but little more. The union, speaking through its secretary, Frank A. Sieverman, outlined the terms it proposed for a settlement of the Cox strike, and the Manufacturers Association after some hesitation authorized its counsel, Theodore Bacon, to spell out its views, too. The State Board was able to bring the two groups together on all but one issue—the union's insistence that all the old employees be rehired. The Manufacturers Association, apparently surprised at the extent of the union's concessions during the first week of hearings, reaffirmed its original position on December 12. The State Board again closed its hearings without recommendations, and the city braced itself for a protracted struggle.⁴⁸

The issue was of course much broader than the safety of a few jobs. Several local unions and the Rochester Trades Assembly had condemned the lockout and pledged their support to the Boot and Shoe Workers. The Trades Assembly had sent an official of that union as its delegate to the American Federation of Labor convention at Detroit, and that body had authorized its General Secretary, Samuel Gompers, to accept the Rochester union's plea for assistance. Gompers wired instructions to Sieverman ordering that negotiations be reopened and that all opposition to new machines be dropped.⁴⁹ When neither Cox nor A. H. Wheeler, president of the Shoe Manufacturers Association, would resume negotiations, Gompers himself came to Rochester but his five-hour session with members of the Manufacturers Association likewise ended in a stalemate. Gompers and Skeffington, the national president of the Boot and Shoe Workers, addressed a mass meeting of 2,000 local shoe workers on December 16, at which the speech of Skeffington, a former Knights of Labor leader, frankly proposing a boycott, was loudly applauded. The shoe workers held a closed meeting at the City Hall two days later and voted to continue their support of the Cox strikers. Gompers, having failed to get any concessions from the manufacturers, left for New York where the executive committee of the A. F. of L. rejected the request for a boycott but pledged its faith in the Rochester strike.⁵⁰

The Manufacturers Association, apparently strengthened in its stand by the appearance of outside interference and by the threat of a boycott, determined to continue its lockout. The holiday season came and went, distracting public attention for a time and slowly wearing down the resistance of the locked-out workers. Only one

manufacturer publicly broke with the association, while many of the factories were able to resume work with the aid of some of their former workers who had dropped out of the union. The Manufacturers Association reaffirmed its readiness on January 8 to take back all operatives who would give up their membership in the Boot and Shoe Workers International, and the next day saw such a general resumption of work that the *Union and Advertiser* pronounced the disturbance at an end.⁵¹ The union, however, continued to maintain pickets at the Cox factory where the strike was not finally settled until the 27th. The company agreed to take back all its former employees as needed, practically the rejected proposal of five weeks before, but its plans for expansion and the eagerness of the other factories to make up for lost production assured jobs to most Rochester's shoeworkers.⁵²

The effects of this protracted strike and lockout were somewhat obscure. The Shoe Manufacturers Association had successfully maintained the prerogatives of management, but at considerable cost. Two of their members were forced into bankruptcy before the year was out, and the association itself soon suspended its meetings.⁵³ The union on its side had lost the majority of its members for a time, and while its entity was maintained and a new local, Number 82, was organized in June 1892, its militant leaders were blacklisted and some had to leave the city to find jobs.⁵⁴

Perhaps the most far reaching effect of the struggle was to determine the conditions on which Rochester's shoe industry could be maintained. The hearings had brought out one fact which was only indirectly related to the task of fixing blame for the strike. They had made it abundantly clear that the effort in the Cox factory at Fairport to produce cheap shoes for the western market inevitably sacrificed the standards of quality which Rochester manufacturers prized. To restore quality, Cox had been compelled to employ skilled artisans and to pay the wages they could command in neighboring factories.⁵⁴ Rochester was, as a result, committed more firmly to quality shoes, and even the rigors of the depression in the mid-nineties would not change its character.

Shoes Take Second Place

The Rochester shoe industry lost its dominant position in the local scene during the depression of the mid-nineties and never regained it. The clothing industry had in fact challenged that leadership for almost a decade and now surged ahead in number of workers and wages paid, as well as in value of product.⁵⁶ Yet the shoe industry remained a strong second and retained that place until the rising photographic industries, headed by Eastman Kodak, outstripped them both by 1905. The shoe industry remained a powerful Rochester industry until the twenties. It faced the hazards common to the shoe industry generally, but Rochester proved able to withstand the fluctuations of fortune better than many of its rivals. The shoe men of Philadelphia, Chicago, and Cincinnati all suffered eclipse, and, while Rochester's rating dropped to eighth position in 1909, it surged ahead again to sixth place by 1919 when its labor force numbered 6,934 and its product aggregated \$35,912,000.⁵⁷

The best the Rochester shoe industry could do in the 1890's was to hold its own. Artemis H. Wheeler, president of the association and active in the Rochester shoe business since 1853 as tanner, traveling salesman, and manufacturer, died in 1897,⁵⁸ a year after Patrick Cox, center of the controversy in 1890, passed on; Jesse W. Hatch, still an earlier pioneer, was content in his eighties to delight his fellow townsmen with reminiscent accounts of the early shoe trade.⁵⁹ Many other early leaders had long since dropped out, while several were foreclosed during the depression,⁶⁰ yet the number of firms, the number of workmen and the value of the product were by 1900 practically at the 1890 level. The recovery had been slow and sound rather than spectacular. Not until 1898 was a year equal to that of 1890 enjoyed, and only ten of the factories employed three hundred or more workers, none as many as the largest in 1890. Most of the sixty-four firms were still bidding for the quality market in women's footwear, but an increasing number were now specializing in babies soft-soled shoes and slippers.⁶¹

The Boot and Shoe Workers International went through an interesting transformation during the decade of the nineties. Its leaders, disillusioned by the failure of their strike and by the refusal of their associates to give them the support of a boycott, placed increasing

reliance on political action. Several of them adopted socialistic doctrines, and when the Central Trades Council refused to endorse their candidates, they withdrew and reestablished a Shoe Council which, however, proved less impressive in its programs for action than in its resolutions and soon renewed its A. F. of L. affiliations.⁶² The old Lasters Protective No. 36 was more aggressive in asserting the claims of its members and secured a restoration of wage cuts in 1894 after the gloom of the previous year began to lift.⁶³ John F. Tobin of Rochester became national president of the Boot and Shoe Workers in 1895 and removed to Boston.⁶⁴ Frank Sieverman entered business on his own. The Boot and Shoe Workers staged a "labor ball" to collect funds for the aid of their members during a strike at the Harding & Todd factory, but their efforts proved futile. That strike and another at the Utz & Dunn plant in 1898 were in protest against a new team and task system introduced by management in a renewed attempt to produce cheap shoes. The strikes were lost but they may have helped to persuade these firms and the others, including E. P. Reed and John Kelly, who joined in the reorganization of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Association that year, to renew their emphasis on quality products.⁶⁵

The new century opened an era of confident expansion for the Rochester shoe industry. *The Shoe and Leather Reporter*, the national trade journal, reported in 1901 that the demand for skilled shoeworkers continued unabated in Rochester and predicted that "next year will see several of the Rochester factories producing more shoes than ever before."⁶⁶ The manufacturers gave a dinner at the Powers Hotel for their salesmen in 1903 and discussed the formation of a social club which would enable them to combine business with pleasure. The first annual banquet of the Rochester Shoe and Leather Club was held at the Eureka clubhouse two years later, with over three hundred in attendance, and plans for a permanent headquarters were proposed in 1906.⁶⁷ The annual banquets presented opportunities for congratulatory addresses, such as that delivered by Percival D. Oviatt, the attorney, in 1905 when he described the army of 10,000 workers who entered the seventy shoe factories of Rochester each day to produce a product valued at \$12,000,000 annually and sold by 125 to 140 traveling salesmen, many of whom were present and able to acknowledge the recognition with applause.⁶⁸

Several new factories were built at this time, greatly expanding the city's productive capacity. It was still a highly fluid trade, and of the seventy firms listed in 1905 only ten had operated under the same name a decade before. Over fifty houses had started up and discontinued during that period, victims in many cases of the hectic style changes of which Rochester was the center. Many others were now acquiring stability through the development of specialty lines in babies' shoes, bedroom slippers and the like, or by virtue of the size of their plants, the number of their styles, and the volume of their production. A visitor from Lynn, the country's leading shoe center, could not help admiring the vigor of Rochester's expansion and the potentialities for growth which its shoe industry enjoyed. The city was not as compactly built up or as congested as the New England shoe towns, he reported, and most of the workers enjoyed an opportunity to cultivate a garden or putter around a free standing home after the day's work was done; moreover the city possessed open spaces for the future expansion of its shoe factories when their quality products captured, as he predicted, a still larger share of the shoe market.⁶⁹

This rosy prospect was supported by evidences of prosperity on all sides. Charles P. Ford, one of Rochester's leading shoemen, reported that orders were beginning to arrive even from the Philippines, America's newly pacified dependency, while he had made regular shipments to Germany and Great Britain for the past fifteen years and more recently to India and Australia. "No machine-made goods anywhere will compare with the shoes made in Rochester," he declared, adding that "as to beauty, workmanship, design, lightness and good wearing qualities" they were unsurpassed.⁷⁰ The Edgar P. Reed factory opened on North Goodman Street in 1906 was the largest and best equipped shoe factory in the state and was unsurpassed in the country in the working conditions it afforded. Light and airy, it boasted rest rooms, sanitary facilities and fire fighting equipment unknown in earlier shoe factories.⁷¹

The Rochester manufacturers were taking a new interest in the national conditions of the industry. The local Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Association revived in 1904 to launch a campaign for the elimination of all tariffs on hides. A delegation of Rochester shoemen visited President Roosevelt and enlisted the cooperation of Con-

gressman Perkins in this cause. Soon a National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Association was formed with Sol Wile of Rochester as secretary and E. P. Reed as vice-president—positions they continued to hold for many years.⁷² Four years elapsed before hides were placed on the free list in a general reform which likewise lowered the tariff on shoes. Rochester rejoiced on both counts, first because of the economy it made possible in leather costs, and second because the quality products of local factories stood to gain rather than lose in the freer competition thus assured.⁷³

A period of relative quiet on the labor front suggested that the workers were sharing more satisfactory returns than in the past. Expansion not only assured sufficient jobs to take up the slack caused by the continued introduction of new machines, but the new machinery in its turn was so costly that managers hesitated to take on unskilled operatives. The socialistic views of some of the leaders of the Boot and Shoe Workers International were acquiring a benign humanitarian quality that had little application to the shoe industry. Indeed the only mention received by this union in the public press in 1905 was an announcement of the fair it staged as a benefit for the projected Labor Temple. Gad Martindale who had succeeded Tobin as local leader after his election to the national presidency in 1895, found much of his time absorbed in extra-curricular activities. His most effective policy in the shoe field was to press for a wider use of the union label, which he made available to factories employing Boot and Shoe members.⁷⁴

Unfortunately the shoeworkers, in Rochester and throughout the industry, were never content with one union. New unions were constantly springing into existence, old ones reviving, and problems of conflicting jurisdiction frequently overshadowed the mundane questions of wages and hours. The more moderate policy of the Boot and Shoe Workers International had been adopted at its convention in Rochester in 1899. A new local, Number 15, had been formed at that time to absorb all the shoeworkers in the city, but soon the lasters withdrew and formed local Number 46, while the girls in the fitting departments organized local Number 150, and the cutters, local Number 137.⁷⁵ Harmony was maintained through the efforts of their national organization, but friction developed in several plants when the Knights of Labor reorganized their old Cutters

Protective Association. When this more militant group pulled three hundred men out of key jobs in several factories in 1910, members of the Boot and Shoe Workers refused to respect the cutters' picket lines, although the work schedule was upset in a few factories for seven months.⁷⁶ This most serious disturbance in the Rochester shoe industry in twenty years finished the Cutters Protective long before the strike was officially called off in May 1911.⁷⁷

The next decade was one of confident expansion for the Rochester shoe industry. The first threat of the new shoe towns in the interior had been met and their competition matched, and Rochester climbed ahead of both Cincinnati and Manchester, New Hampshire, by 1919 when it regained sixth place among American shoe towns with nearly 7,000 employees and a product valued at \$35,912,000. That sum reflected the inflationary effects of the First World War, but even when stated in pre-war values the product more than doubled that of 1909.⁷⁸ However, the shoe industry no longer held a secure hold on third place in Rochester, where the metal, electrical, and optical goods industries were climbing ahead to join the dominant photographic and clothing manufacturers. The character of these new industrial leaders was destined to exert a profound effect on Rochester and on its shoe industry as well; meanwhile that industry enjoyed the most prosperous decade in its history.

As Rochester shoes had sold for many decades on their merits, the city frequently attracted new firms ready to enter the quality market. Such a firm was the Morris & Vaisley Company formed by a union of two firms which had grown up in PennYan and Mt. Morris respectively but moved to Rochester in 1912.⁷⁹ Occasionally an old firm was reorganized or bought out by more vigorous men. Thus, when the Armstrong Shoe Company sold its thirty-year-old factory on Exchange Street to George E. Keith of Boston, the Keith Company, with plants in several cities, announced plans to double its size and increase the output to \$4,000,000 a year.⁸⁰ Shoe workers as well as firms were flocking to Rochester, attracted not only by the new job opportunities here, but also by the good factory conditions in such plants as that of Utz & Dunn which was described at its opening in 1910 as the most modern in the country.⁸¹

Rochester was still regarded as friendly to unions in these years. A Labor Lyceum as well as a Labor Temple had been built, and the

former building served as the headquarters for a national convention in 1913 of the recently organized United Shoe Workers of America.⁸² Two locals of that body had already been formed in Rochester and boasted six hundred members. They made no immediate bid for recognition from management and adopted a conciliatory attitude toward the old Boot and Shoe Workers whose 1,000 members were now enrolled in two locals, Numbers 15 and 137.⁸³ The United developed real strength in Rochester during the war when the tight labor market and the competition for skills prompted most manufacturers to deal openly and generously with their employees. The Rochester shoe industry, geared to produce only for women and children, received no Army contracts—with the exception of the Rochester Last Works—but the mounting demand for consumer goods brought the shoe companies more orders than they could fill.⁸⁴ Both management and labor prospered so handsomely during the war that neither wished to disturb the situation for a year or two after its close. Thus, in May 1921, the Rochester Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Association and the local officials of the United Shoe Workers of America, representing 4,000 Rochester workers, jointly agreed to continue the existing wage schedules for another year and to create a wage adjustment board to handle any wage questions arising out of changes in styles or work methods.⁸⁵

The big problem confronting the Rochester shoe industry was this matter of style. The city's leadership in this field, twenty and thirty years before, had in fact been challenged if not usurped by Brooklyn, even before the war, though Rochester had responded by staging semi-annual style shows to which buyers from all parts of the country flocked for a number of years.⁸⁶ The eleventh and last was held in July 1921.⁸⁷ Already the post-war outburst of style changes, sparked by fashion plates from Paris, where short skirts and sheer stockings focused attention on novelty and decoration in footwear, had disrupted and almost revolutionized the women's shoe business. Brooklyn, Haverhill, and younger style centers in the West proved more responsive to these trends than the more conservative stylists in Rochester, judging from the shoe styles depicted on fashion plates in the *Shoe and Leather Reporter* in the early twenties. Moreover, Rochester's earlier leadership in this field had fostered the growth of larger factories whose managers hesitated to commit large working

forces to what appeared to be freakish styles. Their conservatism in style was accentuated by a conservatism in the use of the lighter colored leathers currently in fashion. Not only did their sales move more slowly than had been expected in 1920 but they were left with sizable stocks of leather ordered at the peak of the leather price market and thus faced the necessity of competing in 1921 with manufacturers able to buy at the sharply deflated prices reported that spring.⁸⁸

It was in the midst of this trying situation that the United Shoe Workers of America presented demands for a wage increase. When, in March 1922, the Manufacturers Association replied that its members were unable to add anything to their costs at this time, the business agent, Fred Meinhart, was prepared to accept this situation, but the joint board of the eight locals in the shoe district demanded his resignation and pressed ahead with the negotiations.⁸⁹ The split in the union front was widened when Meinhart sought and secured court action impounding the union funds in order to assure payment of his salary for the remainder of his contract.⁹⁰ On the heels of this announcement the nine leading shoe firms, whose contracts with the United expired on April 30, announced on May 1 that they would have no further dealings with that union. It was a slack season when this bombshell fell, and only about 200 of the 4,000 members of the United were employed, but these were promptly withdrawn by the union which declared a strike against the nine factories in defense of the right of collective bargaining. A week later the manufacturers announced their readiness to reopen on an open shop basis.⁹¹

The United, with its funds impounded and embroiled in a divisive suit with its former business agent, nevertheless held the loyalty of its members by means of numerous rallies and mass meetings. Promises of contributions from shoe unions in Philadelphia and St. Louis were received, and the opening of a cooperative grocery at the headquarters on Fitzhugh Street was announced.⁹² The State Board of Mediation and Arbitration made an unsuccessful attempt to bring the two sides together during the second week. Later efforts by two citizen groups to institute arbitration proceedings were welcomed by the United but rejected by the Manufacturers Association. One of these groups, headed by Dr. Algernon Crapsey, called on the mayor urging his intercession and pointing out that Lynn, the leading center

for women's shoes, had reached a satisfactory settlement with the same union and would be only too glad to take over the business which normally paid \$1,000,000 in wages to Rochester workmen each month.⁹³ His statistics were no doubt exaggerated, as the wages even in the peak year of 1919 had totalled only \$6,779,757,⁹⁴ yet the urgency for a settlement was great and increased when some of the factories opened their doors to non-union men, with the consequent danger of physical violence as the workers passed through the picket lines.

However, Rochester in 1922 was not, like Lynn or Haverhill, dominated by the shoe industry; it was not even as deeply concerned with this industry as it had been two or three decades before, and the open shop policy adhered to in its new major industries, with the exception of clothing, strengthened the determination of its shoe manufacturers. The mayor delayed two weeks before forwarding without comment Dr. Crapsey's request for arbitration to the manufacturers, and accepted their prompt rejection complacently.⁹⁵ The city responded more promptly to the manufacturers' request for police protection for their workers and shortly banned mass picketing at the plant gates and arrested and arraigned several who defied the order.⁹⁶

As the weeks grew into months the hopelessness of the lockout-strike became apparent, but neither side would relent. The union boasted that only 1,000 of its 4,000 members were unemployed and that none had gone back to the struck plants. Perhaps this was an overstatement, but their solidarity was demonstrated when the shoemakers turned out the largest number of marchers for the Labor Day parade that year.⁹⁷ Certainly most of them would have preferred to take jobs in other Rochester industries or in other shoe towns, even non-union jobs, rather than cross the picket lines of their comrades, a fact the shoe manufacturers themselves were discovering as they struggled against odds to reestablish production schedules. The Sherwood Shoe Company sent a letter to the *Shoe and Leather Reporter* expressing appreciation to its dealers throughout the country for their patience during the labor trouble in Rochester when the company could not always fill orders on time. "It has been slow work," the letter added, "building an organization to resume production of shoes of Sherwood quality."⁹⁸ Apparently other Rochester manufacturers were experiencing the same difficulty for none of them entered shoes in the style shows that fall

or ran their customary advertisements in the *Reporter* — none that is except the firms engaged exclusively in the making of soft soled babies shoes and employing members of the Boot and Shoe Workers International which was not on strike.⁹⁹

The great days of the Rochester shoe industry were over and unfortunately most of its surviving leaders knew it. Not only were the local style shows discontinued, but few if any Rochester-made women's shoes were exhibited at style shows elsewhere for several years. The frequent columns previously printed on the Rochester shoe trade in the *Shoe and Leather Reporter* dwindled to one or two lines an issue in 1923. The longest article the next year told of the death of Edgar P. Reed, long a leader nationally as well as in Rochester, and noted that his firm had lost its entire surplus of \$280,000 as a result of the strike and had paid no dividends for the succeeding year.¹⁰⁰ The Reed company was strong enough to carry on, but Dugan and Hudson liquidated after a year's valiant struggle; soon two of the other nine firms, John Kelly Sons and Utz & Dunn, likewise closed their doors.¹⁰¹

The union had been crushed and wage costs kept down, but the Rochester manufacturers had lost their ability to compete with the other style centers of women's footwear. The only optimistic notes came from the producers of children's shoes and other specialties. The Newcomb-Anderson Shoe Company, the largest producer of soft baby shoes, invented in Rochester some years before, was going strong, while the W. B. Coon Company, makers of out-sized shoes, was expanding rapidly and soon took over the model Utz & Dunn factory.¹⁰² The allied industries, manufacturing lasts, patterns, counters, shoe trees and other specialists prospered.¹⁰³ Even the staple producers began to thrive again in the late twenties when Rochester manufacturers were able, with the lowest wage costs in the industry,¹⁰⁴ to recoup their fortunes. Factory owners in other shoe towns, particularly in New England where the unions were strong, looked to the open-shop center in western New York with longing eyes. A sufficient number moved here, or sprang up here, to give Rochester a new spurt in production, boosting its status in the 1930 census to fifth among American shoe towns.¹⁰⁵

But the revived output of the late twenties, based on a cheaper product, proved unsound or at least incapable of surviving the great depression. Shoe plants closed their doors shortly after the storm

broke, and many of them failed to reopen. Those which did reopen generally found a special product which could be produced with skill and sold on its merits at a good price, such as the "Balance-in-Motion" shoes of D. Armstrong & Company or the Jumping Jack shoes of the new firm of Vaisey-Bristol.¹⁰⁸ The old Boot and Shoe Workers International, A.F. of L., still maintained itself in some of the specialty factories and the new United Shoe Workers of America, C.I.O. gained a footing in Rochester in 1937, organizing several of the larger factories. Any prospect of making Rochester a center for cheap shoes was blasted by the union's resurgence, but the city was little fitted for such a development. More in keeping with the local tradition was E. P. Reed's policy of arranging for the local production of four of the top quality branded lines of women's shoes. If no longer a style center, Rochester would at least cling to the standards of quality which had characterized its industry from the beginning.¹⁰⁷

1. *Directory of the Village of Rochester* (Rochester, 1827), passim; Abner Wakelee's obituary in Boston's First Obit. Book, p.64.
2. *Directory* (1827), p.150; *R. Telegraph*, July 14, 18, 1818; Feb. 15, June 27, August 19, 1820, July 26, Aug. 7, Nov. 6, 1821; April 2, 1822; Aug. 19, 1823.
3. Jesse W. Hatch, "The Old-time Shoemaker and Shoemaking", *RHS Publication V*, pp. 81, 83.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87; see B. E. Hazard, *The Organization of The Boot and Shoe Industry in Mass. before 1875.*, p. 63-78.
6. *Ibid.* pp. 92-93.
7. *R.D.D.*, June 6 (2-2) 1848.
8. *New York Census* (1855). pp. 389; Hazard, *op.cit.* pp. 72, 210; *U.S. Census* (1860), p. 1 xxii.
9. Hatch, *loc. cit.*, pp. 87-91; *D. & C.* Jan. 13, 1855.
10. *D. & A.* Feb. 21, 1851; May 27, 1852; *Dem.*, Jan. 13, 1855; Jan. 1, 2, 1856; *R.D.A.* Nov. 13, 1856; Hatch, *loc. cit.* pp. 91-94.
11. Hatch, *loc. cit.* p. 95; *Dem.* March 3, 1856; May 25, 1857.
12. *U. S. Census* (1860) III, p. 377, F. DeW. Ward, *An Address* (R. 1860) p. 10; *Dem.* May 29, 1861, *U. & A.*, Ag. 27(2-4) 1861; *P.E.* Nov. 30, 1861.
13. *N. Y. Census* (1855), p. 389; *ibid.* (1865) p. 457.
14. *U. & A.* Feb. 19, Dec. 9, 1863; *N. Y. Census* (1865) p. 457.
15. *Dem.* May 15, 16, 1866.
16. *Chronicle*, Oct. 26, 1869; Norman J. Ware, *The Labor Movement in the United States 1860-1895* (N. Y. 1929), p. 19.
17. *Chronicle*, Nov. 23, 1869, July 26, August 25, 1870.
18. *Dem.*, Aug. 29, 1868; Friederich J. Allen, *The Shoe Industry* (N. Y. 1922), pp. 45-53; Harry A. Chase, "Notes on the Early History of the Shoe Industry of Rochester." *The Common Good V*, No. 2 (Nov. 1911), pp. 16-18.
19. *Chronicle*, November 15, 1869; *D. & C.*, March 20, 1874.
20. *Evening Express*, Nov. 20, 1871.

21. *D. & C.*, Feb. 28, April 22, 1871; *U. & A.* March 21, 1871; *Express*, Oct. 25, 1871; *D. & C.*, Ag. 5, 1873.
22. *D. & C.*, Dec. 17, 1872; Nov. 11, 13, 1873.
23. *D. & C.* Nov. 28, 1874; *C. C. Proceedings* (1875-76), p. 38.
24. *D. & C.* Feb. 4, March 6, 1874; *U. & A.* March 6 (2-3) 1883; July 19 (2-5) 1887; *Industries of the City of Rochester* (1888), passim; *City of Rochester Illustrated* (R. 1890), passim
25. *U.S. Census* (1890) VI, pt. 2, p. 490.
26. Victor S. Clark, *History of Manufacturing in the United States* (New York 1929), II, p. 474.
27. *D. & C.* Nov. 25, 1883; Oct. 2, 1884; June 12, 1885.
28. *D. & C.*, Jan. 7, 1880.
29. *D. & C.*, April 17(7-2) 1886; Nov. 27(6-6) 1887.
30. *D. & C.*, Nov. 15, Dec. 7, 1880.
31. *D. & C.*, Dec. 1(7-3) 1887.
32. *D. & C.*, July 24(6-5), July 25(5-6), July 26(6-6) 1888.
33. *U. & A.*, March 27(2-3), 1874; *R. Directory* (1875), p. 429.
34. *D. & C.*, Dec. 7, 8, 9, 1875; Jan. 10, 12, 27, 1876; Feb. 3, 1880.
35. See above, also *D. & C.*, Feb. 3, 4, 5, 1880.
36. *D. & C.* July 14, 18, 19, 20, 23, 28, Aug., 2, 30, Nov. 30, Dec. 5, 1882.
37. *D. & C.*, Sept. 2, 1883.
38. *D. & C.* Sept. 1(7-1), Sept. 11(7-3), 1886; July 4(6-6) 1887.
39. *D. & C.*, Nov. 4(6-5), Nov. 10(6-7) Dec. 9(6-6) Dec. 11(7-1) 1887.
40. *D. & C.*, Jan. 5 (6-5), Jan. 8(6-5) Jan. 9(7-3), Jan. 10(6-5), Jan. 16(6-5), Jan. 20(7-1), Feb. 2(7-3) 1888.
41. *D. & C.* June 4(6-7), June 6(5-4), June 8(6-8), June 9(5-3) 1888.
42. *D. & C.* March 15(6-5), August 21(5-7) 1889.
43. *D. & C.*, Jan. 4(6-6) 1890.
44. *D. & C.*, Oct. 25(2-4), Oct. 27(6-6) 1890.
45. *D. & C.*, Sept. 2(6-4) 1890.
46. *D. & C.* Oct. 25(2-4), Oct. 27(6-6) 1890.
47. *D. & C.* Nov. 6(6-5) Nov. 29(7-1) Dec. 2(7-1) 1890.
48. *D. & C.* Dec. 1(6-8) Dec. 9(7-1), Dec. 10(6-6) Dec. 11(6-4) Dec. 12(6-5), Dec. 13(6-6) 1890.
49. *D. & C.* Dec. 3(7-1), Dec. 4(6-6), Dec. 6(5-6), Dec. 9(7-1) 1890.
50. *U. & A.*, Dec. 15(5-7), Dec. 16(8-5), Dec. 19(5-6) 1890; *D. & C.* Dec. 16(6-6), Dec. 17(7-1), Dec. 18(7-1), Dec. 19(6-6), Dec. 20 (6-5) 90.
51. *U. & A.* Jan 6(5-5), Jan. (5-6), Jan. 9(5-5) 1891.
52. *U. & A.*, Jan. 27(5-6) 1891.
53. *D. & C.* Jan. 20 (7-2), Dec. 31 (9-2) 1891; *P.E.* June 23 (6-7) 1897.
54. *U. & A.* March 17(2-5) 1891; *Illustrated History of Rochester Trades Assembly* (Rochester, 1891), p. 155.
55. *U. & A.* Dec. 9(5-5/6), Dec. 10(5-5), Dec. 11(5-5/6) 1890, May 16(5-5) *Herald, Rochester The Flour City* (1893) 56-60.
56. *Herald*, June 27(6-5), 1894; *U. S. Census* (1900), Dec. 13(10-1) 1897.
57. *U. S. Census* (1900) IX, p. 747; *ibid.* (1910), IX, p. 890; *ibid.* (1920), IX, p. 1088.
58. *Times*, Oct. 1(7-4) 1893; see also *Clarke's Biographical Record* p. 328-9.
59. *U. & A.*, Dec. 9(10-1) 1893; Nov. 10 (4-1) 1894.
60. *Herald*, Feb. 25,(6-7) 1894; *D. & C.* May 15(8-7), Nov. 9(17-1) 1895, *Herald* Jan. 7(6-2, 7-2) 1897.

61. *Herald* June 4(9-2) 1898; Jan. 11(7-1) 1899; U. S. *Census* (1900)
62. *D. & C.* Nov. 23(12-6) 1895; Jan. 1(10-6), March 7(13-1) 1896.
63. *Herald* March 31(6-2), April 4(7-5) Ap. 5(6-4) Ap. 6(7-5), Ap. 10(6-1) Ap. 17(6-5) 1894; *D. & C.* Ap. 5(10-7), Ap. 6(10-7), Ap. 7(9-1), Ap. 14(12-6), Ap. 17(10-5) June 20(8-5) 1894; July 30(9-2), July 31(10-5), Aug. 2(8-6) 1895.
64. *D. & C.* Ap. 17(8-5) 1895; June 17(10-6) 1896.
65. *P. E.*, March 3(8-2), March 26(12-4) 1898; *Herald*, May 13(6-4), June 2(6-4) 1898.
66. *Herald*, Nov. 26 (8-2) 1901.
67. *P. E.* Feb. 23(8-5) 1903; *Herald* Feb. 15(9-2) 1905; March 8(7-1) 1906.
68. *Herald* Feb. 15(9-2) 1905; Feb. 12(10-1) 1909.
69. *P. E.* Oct. 13(8-4) 1903; Oct. 19 (6-1) 1905; May 14(11-3); May 28(9-1) 1906.
70. *P. E.* June 30, (9-1) 1906
71. *P. E.* July 3(11-1) 1906; *P. E.* Nov. 20(8-5), Dec. 6(8-7) 1905;
72. *Herald*, Dec. 15(6-3) 1905; *P. E.* Nov. 20(8-5), Dec. 6(8-7) 1905; *D. & C.* March 6, 1931.
73. *P. E.*, March 18, (6-1) 1909; *Herald*, August 5(9-5) 1909.
74. *P. E.*, Jan. 5(7-1) 1903; *Herald* Feb. 28(6-2) 1905; Emanuel Koveleski, *Illustrated History of Central Trades and Labor Council*, (Rochester 1927), p. 105.
75. Emanuel Koveleski, *Illustrated History of the Central Trades and Labor Council* (Rochester 1927), p. 105, H. B. Davis, *Shoes, the Workers and the Industry* (N. Y. 1940), p. 166.
76. *Herald* Jan. 8(8-5), Jan. 14(8-2), March 6(9-1) 1910; *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, July 1913, p. 39.
77. *Herald* May 6(14-3) 1911.
78. U. S. *Census* (1910) IX PP. 890-891; *ibid* (1920) X p. 509.
79. *P. E.* March 18(6-7) 1912.
80. *U. & A.* Dec. 6(8-4) 1913.
81. *Herald* March 24(8-2) 1910; *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, May 8, 1913, p. 29.
82. *P. E.*, August 22(6-2) 1913.
83. Koveleski, *op.cit.*, p. 105; *P. E.*, August 22(6-2) 1913; *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, June 1913; p. 39.
84. *Rochester World War Service Records* Volume III, p. 326.
85. *Monthly Labor Review*, July 1921, p. 159; C. of C. *Publication* pp. 135-7(1921).
86. *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, Dec. 25, 1919, p. 110a.
87. *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, Jan. 13, p. 33, Jan. 27, p. 57, July 7, p. 40, 1921.
88. See the retrospective article on the revolution in shoe styles in *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, March 5, 1925, pp. 20-21; also Thomas L. Norton, *Trade Union Policies in the Massachusetts Shoe Industry 1919-1929* (N. Y. 1932), pp. 34-42. 176-178.
89. *T. U.*, April 1(9-5), 8(14-6,7), 10(9-23) 1922.
90. *T. U.*, April 25(9-1,2), 26(9-5,6) 29(9-2,3) 1922.
91. *T. U.* May 1(9-4,5), 3(9-4), 9(8-5,6) 1922.
92. *T. U.*, May 18(9-5,6), 23(9-2), June 1(8-3), 9(12-1), 12(17-1,2) 1922.
93. *D. & C.*, June 8, 1922; *An. Report of the N.Y. State Industrial Commissioner* (1922) pp. 122, 126.
94. U. S. *Census* (1920) IX, p. 1088-1091.
95. *D. & C.* June 23, 24, 1922; *T. U.*, June 27, 1922.

96. *D. & C.* June 9, Aug. 22, *T.U.*, June 29(8-5), July 1(9-1), August 4(8-2), 5(9-2), 21(19-6) 1922.
97. *T.U.*, August 9(15-4) 1922; *D. & C.*, Sept. 5, 1922.
98. *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, Oct. 5, 1922, p. 45.
99. *Monthly Labor Review XVI Number 6* (June 1923), pp. 155-166; *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, July 13, p. 70, July 27, p. 127, 138, 1922; Dec. 27, 1923, pp. 71-72.
100. *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, Feb. 7, 1924, p. 70-71.
101. *Ibid.*, May 29, 1924, p. 41, *D. & C.*, Oct. 3, 1926.
102. *D. & C.*, Oct. 3, 1926; *R. Evening Journal* Oct. 11, 1926; *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, 1930, Dec. 13, p. 16.
103. *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, August 21, 1924; pp. 37-43; *T.U.* Jan. 10(14-13) 1949.
104. U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Bulletin No. 483*. (1928), pp. 14-16.
105. *Shoe and Leather Reporter*, March 5, 1925, p. 38; Dec. 27, 1930, p. 11 *U. S. Census (1930) Manufacturing III*, p. 380.
106. *D. & C.*, Nov. 17, 1939; March 14, 1948.
107. *D. & C.*, April 11, 1952.

